

**National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Ames Research Center
Moffett Field, CA 94035-1000**

**Selection of Contractor
For
NASA Advanced Supercomputing Facility N258 Electrical Supply Reliability
Improvement Project Phase IB and Phase II
NNA10328452R
August 19, 2010**

On August 19, 2010, I, along with certain NASA Source Evaluation Committee (SEC) Ex-Officio members, met with the SEC members appointed to evaluate proposals for the procurement of NASA Advanced Supercomputing Facility N258 Electrical Supply Reliability Improvement Project Phase IB and Phase II. During this meeting, the SEC presented the findings from its Evaluation Report. We discussed the relative merits of the proposals to assure that I had a full understanding of the SEC's evaluation.

The evaluation team conducted its evaluation based on Section M of the solicitation. There were three voting members on the evaluation team. The evaluation team completed its initial evaluation on July 9, 2010. Discussions were held with both Offerors, as both proposals were technically acceptable, and the Final Proposal Revisions (FPRs) were received on August 11, 2010.

I assessed the SEC's findings and evaluation of proposals. This Source Selection Statement reflects my independent judgment of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposals, and sets forth my selection decision.

Procurement Description

NASA Ames Research Center currently has a requirement to provide a reliable power supply for the NASA Advanced Supercomputing Facility. The work to be performed under this contract consists of 1) providing a final design (based on the design documents provided in the Statement of Work) for Rotary Uninterruptible Power Supply (RUPS) units, complete with full system switchgear and auxiliary systems housed in outdoor enclosures, and 2) providing labor, equipment, and materials to install the infrastructure. All common equipment must be capable of accommodating up to four RUPS units operating in parallel.

This procurement was conducted in accordance with FAR Part 15 as a 100% HubZone set-aside. A Firm Fixed Price Contract will be awarded. The anticipated period of performance is as follows:

(a) BASE PERIOD (Base Requirement)

The performance of the base period shall be for two (2) years from the notice to proceed.

(b) OPTION PERIOD 1

If exercised, the period of performance shall be twelve (12) months from the end of the Base Period.

(c) OPTION PERIOD 2

If exercised, the period of performance shall be twelve (12) months from the end of the Option Period 1.

Evaluation Procedure

Proposals were evaluated in accordance with the requirements of FAR Subpart 15.3, "Source Selection," as supplemented by NFS Subpart 1815.3, "Source Selection." Solicitation provision FAR 52.215-1, Instructions to Offerors-Competitive Acquisitions, informed Offerors that the Government intended to award a contract based solely on initial offers. However, the provision also stated that the Government reserved the right to hold discussions if determined to be necessary by the Contracting Officer.

The Request for Proposals (RFP) identified three evaluation Factors that were defined as Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Price. Price is the most important Factor. Mission Suitability and Past Performance are approximately equal to each other and, when combined, are approximately equal to Price.

The Mission Suitability Factor consists of two Subfactors. The Subfactors are shown below with their respective point allocation, indicative of the relative importance of those evaluation areas.

MISSION SUITABILITY FACTOR	
Subfactors	Assigned Weight
Overall Understanding of Project Approach to Requirement Management	800
Safety and Health Plan	200
TOTAL	1000

Potential Mission Suitability adjectival ratings are: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, and Poor.

With regard to the Past Performance Factor, the RFP provided for evaluation purposes Level of Confidence ratings of: "Very High Level of Confidence"; "High Level of Confidence"; "Moderate Level of Confidence"; "Low Level of Confidence"; "Very Low

Level of Confidence”; and “Neutral/Unknown Level of Confidence” depending on the SEC’s assessment of each proposal in this area. For each Offeror and its major subcontractors, the SEC evaluated overall Past Performance with respect to comparability in contract size, content, and complexity to the requirements of the current acquisition. This Factor was designed to provide an opportunity to evaluate the quality of goods and services provided by the Offerors to the Agency and other organizations as either a prime or subcontractor. The Past Performance evaluation was based on the information provided by the Offeror in its Past Performance Volume II, an assessment of customer questionnaires submitted on behalf of each Offeror and of its major subcontractors, and some independent investigation through the NASA Past Performance Data Base (PPDB), as allowed by the RFP.

For the Price Factor, the SEC performed a price analysis on the proposed prices to assess the reasonableness of the proposed prices.

Solicitation and Receipt of Proposals

The solicitation (RFP) was posted on the NASA Acquisition Internet Service (NAIS) and Federal Business Opportunities (FedBizOpps) websites May 26, 2010.

One minor amendment was issued to respond to the questions received. Proposals were due on June 28, 2010.

Two proposals were received in response to the RFP by the specified closing time and date. The Offerors’ names and addresses are as follows:

1. South Bay, EDC. Inc.
955 W. Chandler Blvd. Ste. 14
Chandler AZ, 85225-4906
2. Sygnos, Inc.
3996 Mahalia Avenue, Unit D
San Diego, CA 92122

Written proposals were received from each Offeror. Each written proposal consisted of three separate volumes, corresponding to the three respective evaluation Factors, in accordance with Section L of the Solicitation and FAR Parts 15.101 and 15.306. A copy of each proposal for the two Offerors was issued to each of the three voting members of the SEC.

Evaluation Process

After receipt of both the initial proposals and the FPRs, the SEC members individually reviewed each proposal and met to discuss individual findings. The SEC identified Mission Suitability findings for each proposal. In Mission Suitability, the identified strengths and weaknesses were categorized either as a “Significant Strength” or “Significant Weakness” or, if not significant, as a “Strength” or “Weakness.” These findings were used to establish adjectival ratings and numerical scores for each Mission Suitability Subfactor, and, ultimately,

numerical scores for overall Mission Suitability. No “Deficiencies” were identified in either of the Mission Suitability proposals.

The SEC also identified Past Performance findings during both the initial and final evaluations. No adverse Past Performance information or weaknesses were identified for either of the Offerors in this Factor. Each identified Past Performance strength was categorized as either a “Significant Strength” or, if not significant, as a “Strength.” During its evaluation, the SEC used these findings to establish Level of Confidence ratings for each of the Offerors in this Factor.

The SEC also conducted an analysis of each price proposal in accordance with FAR 15.404-1(b) during both the initial and final evaluations, and determined whether the price proposal was fair and reasonable on the basis of adequate price competition in accordance with FAR 15.403-3(b).

I reviewed the SEC’s findings for Mission Suitability and the resultant adjectival ratings and numerical scores. I reviewed the findings and Level of Confidence ratings for Past Performance. I reviewed the SEC’s price analysis and price reasonableness determination for Price. I fully considered all of this information prior to making my final selection decision.

FINAL EVALUATION FINDINGS OF THE SEC

Mission Suitability Factor

The following addresses the Mission Suitability findings for both Offerors.

South Bay, EDC, Inc.

The Mission Suitability proposal submitted by South Bay received 848 points (out of a possible 1000) and is the higher score between the two Offerors.

In the Overall Understanding of Project Subfactor, two Significant Strengths were identified. Significant Strength (1) was assigned because the individuals identified as those responsible for Project 1 design have excellent qualifications and extensive relevant experience in high voltage and RUPS systems, which would promote a superior design for the Government. Significant Strength (2) was assigned because South Bay’s proposal provided a detailed approach, including necessary modifications and proposed switching scheme, which successfully allows utility and RUPS modes to feed the load at the same time. This ensures that this critical capability will be successfully implemented in the design.

Three other Strengths were assigned. Strength (1) was assigned for proposing a thorough and realistic schedule. Strength (2) was assigned for proposing a conceptual layout of the RUPS equipment utilizing existing raceway and concrete pad. Strength (3) was assigned for proposing the use of RUPS equipment which operates at optimal voltage.

No Significant Weaknesses or other Weaknesses were assigned. South Bay received 728 points (out of a possible 800) and a rating of Excellent for the Overall Understanding of the Project Subfactor.

In the Safety and Health Plan Subfactor, no Significant Strengths were assigned and one other Strength was assigned. Strength (1) was assigned because South Bay proposed a safety and health plan that details effective processes for safety and health management and demonstrates an ongoing safety focus. No Significant Weaknesses or Weaknesses were identified.

South Bay received 120 points (out of a possible 200) and a rating of Good for the Safety Subfactor.

Sygnos, Inc.

The Mission Suitability proposal submitted by Sygnos received 664 points (out of a possible 1000) and is the lower score between the two Offerors.

In the Overall Understanding of the Project Subfactor, no Significant Strengths or Significant Weaknesses were assigned. Three other Strengths and one other Weakness were identified. Strength (1) was assigned for proposing a thorough and realistic schedule. Strength (2) was assigned for proposing a conceptual layout of the RUPS equipment utilizing existing raceway and concrete pad. Strength (3) was assigned for proposing the use of RUPS equipment which operates at optimal voltage. Weakness (1) was assigned because Sygnos' proposed approaches for allowing utility and RUPS modes to feed the load at the same time were either incomplete or lacked sufficient detail.

The Offeror received 544 points (out of a possible 800) for Overall Understanding of the Project Subfactor and a rating of Good.

In the Safety and Health Plan Subfactor, no Significant Strengths were assigned and one other Strength was assigned. Strength (1) was assigned because Sygnos proposed a safety and health plan that details effective processes for safety and health management and demonstrates an ongoing safety focus. No Significant Weaknesses or Weaknesses were identified.

Sygnos received 120 points (out of a possible 200) and a rating of Good for the Safety Subfactor.

Past Performance Factor

The following addresses the Past Performance strengths for each of the Offerors.

South Bay, EDC., Inc.

The Past Performance evaluation of South Bay resulted in a Very High Level of Confidence. One Significant Strength was identified. The Significant Strength was assigned because South Bay demonstrated exceptional past performance in relevant areas of the requirement,

and has consistently received very high ratings and recommendations from its customers. No other Strengths, Significant Weaknesses or Weaknesses were identified.

Sygnos, Inc.

The Past Performance evaluation of Sygnos resulted in a Very High Level of Confidence. One Significant Strength was identified. The Significant Strength was assigned because Sygnos demonstrated exceptional past performance in relevant areas of the requirement, and has consistently received very high ratings and recommendations from its customers. No other Strengths, Significant Weaknesses or Weaknesses were identified.

Price Factor

The SEC evaluated each Offeror's Price proposal. This included verifying that each Offeror is in compliance with the RFP requirements, a comparison of proposed prices received in response to the solicitation, and a comparison of proposed prices with independent Government cost estimates.

South Bay had the lower total proposed price.

Sygnos had the higher total proposed price.

The delta between the prices of the two Offerors is significant.

SELECTION DECISION OF THE SOURCE SELECTION AUTHORITY FOR NASA ADVANCED SUPERCOMPUTING FACILITY N258 ELECTRICAL SUPPLY RELIABILITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT PHASE IB AND PHASE II

Introduction: FAR Part 15.308 "Source Selection Decision" states: "The source selection authority's (SSA) decision shall be based on a comparative assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in the solicitation. While the SSA may use reports and analyses prepared by others, the source selection decision shall represent the SSA's independent judgment. The source selection decision shall be documented, and the documentation shall include the rationale for any business judgments and tradeoffs made or relied on by the SSA, including benefits associated with additional costs. Although the rationale for the selection decision must be documented, that documentation need not quantify the tradeoffs that led to the decision."

My selection decision represents my independent judgment. I carefully reviewed all of the SEC's findings to ensure a full understanding thereof. I did not simply count and compare the numbers of strengths and weaknesses; rather, I considered the potential impact of strength or weakness, and its relevance to this proposed effort, against the selection criteria prescribed in the RFP.

Assessment of the SEC's Findings:

As the Source Selection Authority, I hereby concur with and adopt all of the findings of the SEC. My selection is based on my analysis and tradeoffs between the three evaluation factors -- Price, Past Performance, and Mission Suitability. As stated in the RFP, Price is the most important factor. Mission Suitability and Past Performance factors are approximately equal to each other and when combined, are approximately equal to Price.

Both Offerors' proposed prices are considered fair and reasonable. South Bay's proposed price, however, is significantly lower than Sygnos' proposed price.

With respect to Past Performance, I noted that both Offerors demonstrated successful completion of projects of similar size and technical scope to this project and both received a Very High Level of Confidence Rating. Therefore, I find no discriminator here in the Past Performance Factor.

There is an evident difference in the respective Mission Suitability ratings. South Bay's Mission Suitability Score is markedly higher than Sygnos' score. This difference in score was based on the two Significant Strengths in South Bay's proposal. These Significant Strengths, i.e. the highly qualified and experienced individuals proposed to be responsible for the design of the project and the detailed approach to meet the requirements of the switching scheme, clearly demonstrate a very high probability that South Bay is capable of successfully implementing this project in a manner that will meet all of the requirements. South Bay proposed a significantly lower overall Price and its proposal is superior with respect to Mission Suitability. Therefore, it represents the best value for the Government. I select South Bay, EDC. Inc. for contract award.



George Sutton
Source Selection Authority